

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
EASTERN DIVISION**

CHARLOTTE HOLMES,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 1:24-1094-STA-jay

CARLI LAWSON, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On October 31, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation that Plaintiff's amended complaint be dismissed without prejudice *sua sponte*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). (ECF No. 15.) On December 17, 2024, the Court granted Plaintiff's second motion for extension of time to file any objections to the report and recommendation. (ECF No. 19.) Plaintiff was given until February 3, 2025, but has failed to file any objections. The failure to object to the report releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985)). That is, the district court is not required to review — under a de novo or any other standard — “any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Id.* Accordingly, a district court should adopt the findings and rulings of the Magistrate Judge to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*; *see also United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 950 (6th Cir. 1981.)

The time for filing objections has passed. Plaintiff has neither objected, nor has she provided a legitimate reason why she failed to do so. Further, upon the Court's independent review of the record, there does not appear to be any error in the report and recommendation.

Therefore, the Court **ADOPTS** it in its entirety. This matter is hereby **DISMISSED** without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). The Clerk of the Court is **DIRECTED** to enter judgment accordingly.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ S. Thomas Anderson
S. Thomas Anderson.
United States District Judge

Date: February 7, 2025